## Web Version without Attachments

MEMORANDUM FOR DOD MODELING AND SIMULATION (M&S) WORKING GROUP (MSWG) MEMBERS

SUBJECT: MSWG Meeting Minutes for July 19, 1996

CAPT Hollenbach, Director, Defense Modeling and Simulation Office (DMSO), chaired the July 19, 1996, MSWG meeting at the Institute for Defense Analyses' (IDA) facility at 2001 North Beauregard, Alexandria, Virginia. Attachment 1 identifies attendees. Meeting highlights follow:

Additional Meetings and Conferences. Several members added meetings of interest. Of particular note are two occurring prior to the next MSWG meeting:

- <u>Joint Simulation System (JSIMS) Command, Control, Communications, and Computers (C4) Kickoff Meeting</u>. This meeting will be at MITRE's Reston, Virginia, facility on August 8 and 9, 1996.
- <u>Joint Requirement Oversight Council Review Board</u>, <u>July 23</u>, <u>1996</u>. Lt Col Illinger noted that this JROC Review Board is focused on Service M&S Issues, rather than M&S Briefs as stated in the handout.

DoD Instruction 5000.61, "DoD Modeling and Simulation (M&S) Verification, Validation and Accreditation, (VV&A)," April 29, 1996--Administrative Notes. CAPT Hollenbach stated that this recently approved instruction designates the DMSO as the "DoD VV&A focal point," and encourages the Heads of DoD Components to publish, if needed, their own "implementation" or "supplementation" documents by August 28, 1996, when the 120-day implementation period ends. CAPT Hollenbach stressed that additional instructions are required only if the Component feels they are needed. The DoD Instruction also requires each DoD Component to designate their own "VV&A focal points" to provide an interface with the DMSO and other DoD Components on VV&A issues.

 $<sup>^1</sup>$  Defined as: "The publication by the DoD Components of directives, instructions, regulations, and related documents that add to, restrict or otherwise modify the policies and procedures of DoD issuances." (See DoD 5025.1-M, "DoD Directives Systems Procedures," August 1994)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Defined as: "The publication by the DoD Components of directives, instructions, regulations, and related documents that define responsibilities and authorities and establish the internal management processes necessary to carry out the policies required by DoD issuances." (See DoD 5025.1-M)

## ACTIONS:

- (1) DoD Components planning implementations or supplementations of DoDI 5000.61 should complete their efforts by August 28, 1996. Any DoD Component unable to meet this date should advise the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology (USD(A&T)) before August 28 and provide an estimated completion date.
- (2) The DMSO will provide MSWG members a listing of previously identified Component VV&A expertise and request confirmation of DoD Component "VV&A focal points" by separate correspondence.

<u>Functional Area Councils and/or Functional Working Groups</u> (FWG) Progress Reports.

- Acquisition Council and FWG. Ms. Morgan, OSD OD(TSE&E), reported progress of the Acquisition Council (Attachment 2) and outlined the process the Acquisition FWG is using to draft its Functional Area Appendix. She expects a working draft appendix to be completed by July 30, 1996. She also presented the agenda for the next Council meeting on August 9. COL Hardin, Army, took exception with the topic addressing Program Budget Decision (PBD) 870 (Service responses). He said: it was an inappropriate topic for the Acquisition Council agenda; that the "correct" person from the Army would not be at the Council meeting to address the issue; and, that it was a dead issue. He asked Ms. Morgan to petition Dr. Sanders, chair of the Acquisition Council, to remove PBD 870 as a council agenda item. COL Hardin then posed the more general question of who "owned" PBD 870. Dr. Henningsen said that OSD OD(PA&E) "owns" the issue and stated that it was not part of this year's POM issues. One of the members asked about the status of this PBD. Dr. Henningsen indicated that PBD 870 is not part of the current POM cycle nor is it an active issue before the POM Review Group; however, the M&S investment data obtained from the Services, Joint Staff and OSD M&S has been under review by OSD LCDR Butler, J-7, said that it would be an issue in the next POM cycle and also subject to a Chairman's Program Assessment (CPA). LCDR Butler also indicated that the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) was looking for official documentation on PBD 870 M&S investments and wants the data from "DARPA and OSD/WHS." Lt Col Illinger noted that the JROC has only the briefing slides and may want to establish the actual audit trail for the funds. The group consensus was that PBD 870 will almost certainly appear in the next POM review cycle.
- <u>Analysis Council and FWG</u>. Dr. Henningsen reported that she has asked Col Jefferson, DMSO Deputy Director, to host a meeting

with the three FWG chairs to determine if their respective courses of action are convergent or divergent.

- Training Council and FWG. Mr. Hartman reported that the Training Functional Plan is in initial coordination by the FWG with a final version due for presentation at the July 31 Training FWG. He reported that the Training Council met in Orlando Florida on July 8 to review the status of the JSIMS effort. They reviewed the JSIMS Executive Agent and JSIMS Development Agent funding issues, the overall development process, and planned deliverables. There are still a number of critical unknowns facing the JSIMS program, in terms of funding (to include the impact of PBD 870 on the Service M&S programs), schedules, and products. He also reported that the Joint War-fighting Center is defining the functional requirements that JSIMS must address for joint training. The next Training Council meeting will be on September 25 in Room 5 of Pentagon Room 1E801 from 12:00 noon to 3:00 p.m.

Proposed Change to Aggregate Level Simulation Protocol (ALSP) Management Plan. CAPT Hollenbach reiterated the rationale outlined in the June 25, 1996, meeting proposing change to the ALSP Management Plan (Attachment 3). He noted that the current ALSP Management Plan requires the EXCIMS to approve the ALSP Configuration Management and VV&A Plans. The ALSP action agent, US Army Simulation, Training and Instrumentation Command, requested that the Management Plan be changed to allow approval at a lower level. CAPT Hollenbach asked the MSWG for acknowledgment of the need for considering change to the ALSP Management Plan. There being no dissent, CAPT Hollenbach then reviewed five DMSO-developed options for the MSWG's consideration and asked if the group had any other alternative approaches; however, none were offered. CAPT Hollenbach called for discussion and recommendation among the five options already addressed. COL Hardin, Army, asked if the proposed action concerned only the Joint Training Confederation (JTC). the following discussion, CAPT Hollenbach acknowledged that while there are seven active federations using ALSP technology, this action concerns only the JTC. COL Hardin then moved that approval be maintained at the EXCIMS level, specifically the Training Functional Area Council.

<u>ACTION</u>: Without dissent, the MSWG agreed to recommend that the EXCIMS maintain oversight approval over the ALSP Management Plan. The EXCIMS' Training Functional Area Council will review and approve the ALSP Configuration Management and VV&A Plans.

 $\underline{\text{M\&S Cost Categories Information Briefing}}.$  Mr. Dunn, AMSO, reported on an initiative by the Services to develop a common means for framing M&S costs. He stressed that this briefing is preliminary in nature and that it has not yet been staffed through

the Services or approved by the Service principals who chartered the effort: Mr. Hollis, Maj Gen Case, and RADM Davis. fort came about because of internal dissatisfaction by the Services over their responses to the CPA, PBD 870, and Defense Planning Guidance funding reductions that focused on alleged duplication and overlap of M&S. Under the pressure of time, the Services responded individually and without the benefit of consistent or compatible methodologies. To better address these issues in the future, the Services tasked an O-6 level Working Group to define The working group identified a series of M&S cost categories. assumptions, determined a methodology for the study, and developed a matrix for "binning" M&S costs. The matrix consists of three generic domain categories (Training & Operations, Acquisition Support, and Analysis and Assessment) and five cost categories (Development, Maintenance and Upgrade, Operations and Support, Infrastructure, and Facilities). The approach appears to have joint, Service, and DoD-wide utility. COL Hardin asked if the MSWG was willing to sponsor this effort. Several MSWG members supported this approach; there were no dissenting views. CAPT Hollenbach agreed, on behalf of the MSWG, to take the lead when the Services hand it off.

 $\underline{\text{ACTION}}$ : The DMSO will announce further actions on this item by separate memorandum following the Working Group's briefing to its Service principals.

<u>HLA Update</u>. CAPT Hollenbach traced the history of the HLA effort and outlined future development plans for the HLA as shown in Attachment 4. He emphasized that the EXCIMS will be asked to endorse the base-line HLA and future development plans at their September 5, 1996, meeting. Several members commented that this briefing gave them their first real understanding of the overall effort. Mr. Hartman suggested that this briefing should be given to each of the EXCIMS members.

<u>ACTION</u>: The DMSO has arranged to brief the HLA to all EXCIMS members.

Joint Warrior Interoperability Demonstration 1996 (JWID 96), August 5-30, 1996. Mr. Stanford summarized M&S-related activities during the upcoming JWID 96. US Central Command is the host Unified Combat Command and the Army is the sponsoring Service. The scenario is based in USCENTCOM's area of responsibility and concentrates on four operational threads: seamless exchange of intelligence; Crisis Action Planning; logistics Total Asset Visibility; and Theater Missile Defense. Integrating C4I and M&S for the warfighter is focus of the M&S portion of the demonstration. Although visitors may observe any part of JWID 96, the recommended

visitation period is August 26-30, 1996. See Attachment 5 for JWID 96 locations and other details.

## MSWG and EXCIMS Meetings

- MSWG Meeting. The next MSWG meeting will be on Tuesday, August 27, 1996, from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., in Room 118 at IDA's 2001 North Beauregard facility in Alexandria, Virginia. The agenda will focus on EXCIMS issues.
- EXCIMS Meeting. The EXCIMS will be Thursday, September 5, 1996, in Pentagon Room 3D1019, from 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. Tentative agenda topics include decision briefings on the High-Level Architecture baseline definition and proposed changes to the ALSP Management Plan.

ACTION: MSWG members should ensure their principal is scheduled for this meeting and fully prepared to address the action items. Read ahead materials for EXCIMS principals will be distibuted through their respective MSWG members.

There being no further items of business, CAPT Hollenbach adjourned the meeting.

James W. Hollenbach Captain, USN Chairman, DoD Modeling and Simulation Working Group

Attachments
As stated